

vii 11. 24) 'Eusebius ministered to the confessors in prison and saw to the burial of the blessed martyrs'. Yet in the middle of the century Cyprian, though he drew like the others a definite line between confessors and martyrs, drew it at a different point: to him any one who endured torture for the name of Christ was a martyr, even though he survived. And this was apparently the established usage at that time of the African Church, see *Cypr. epp.* x, xv, xviii, lxxvi.

One word in conclusion as to the meaning, under the hypothesis of this interpretation of verse 13, which should be put on verse 12. The 'good confession before many witnesses' I take to be the Renunciations and Profession of faith in the face of the congregation which preceded Baptism. But the 'good' confession cannot be separated from the 'good' fight earlier in the same verse: both are forms which the 'witness' takes. Only we must not suppose that the 'good fight', either there or in 2 Tim. iv 7, has necessarily anything to do with martyrdom. The Christian's whole life is a contest: and I see no reason to suppose that the apostle, though he was clearly expecting death when he wrote 2 Tim. iv 6-8, was expecting any other than a natural death.

C. H. TURNER.

### 'LEVI SON OF ALPHEAUS'.

THERE is a well-known various reading in Mk. ii 14, where instead of Levi (or Levis) son of Alphaeus the Western texts have 'James son of Alphaeus'. The attestation is

D ⊙ 565 69 & c *abceffgr* § 10 Ephr. *Diat.* 58 *Diat. arab.* vii 9  
The Sinai Palimpsest has lost a leaf here. Both readings were known to Origen when he wrote the *Contra Celsum* (c. 249). In the above list § denotes De Bruyne's African *Capitula*.

The special object of this Note is to point out that both MSS of the Arabic Diatessaron actually read 'James' (يعقوب), as is duly recorded in Ciasca's Arabic apparatus, though he regarded it as a scribe's blunder and put *Levi* in his text and in his Latin translation. From Ciasca it passed to the English editions of Hamlyn Hill and H. W. Hogg, and also to the recently published German translation by Preuschen and Pott (Heidelberg, 1926)!

It may be added by way of confirmation on Syriac ground that Barsalibi in his Commentary on the Gospels, commenting on the List of the Twelve in Matt. x, says that two Apostles were Publicans, *viz.* Matthew and James son of Alphaeus. It is therefore certain that the

Syriac Diatessaron attests 'James' for 'Levi' in Mk. ii 14 and probable that *syr.* S and C, had they been extant, would have had the same reading. In the Latin Diatessaron only one Publican is called; he is named Matthew (F 20, L 31): the Arabic (A vii 25 ff) gives also the call of Levi the Publican who made a feast (Lk. v 27 ff), but this Levi is not represented as an Apostle, or as the same as 'James son of Alphaeus' in A vii 9.

It should be noticed (1) that there is no sign of a various reading 'James' for 'Levi' in Lk. v 27, and (2) that the Western reading 'James' in Mk. ii 14 is obviously a blunder or blundering correction, suggested by the fact that James son of Alphaeus was the known name of an Apostle, whereas Levi son of Alphaeus is otherwise unknown. 'Levi' therefore is genuine in Mk. ii 4: the strongest external testimony is the fact that it is the name in Luke v, in a section of that Gospel directly based on Mark, while among our MSS its best supporters are  $\aleph$  B W and 1 &c.

But how large and how various is the 'Western' phalanx! Now that the correct text of the Syriac Diatessaron is assured we have the solid support of all Latin texts before the Vulgate, all extant Syriac texts before the Peshitta. In Greek we have D, the two Pontic texts  $\Theta$  and 565, the 'Ferrar Group', and (if we may press the evidence of Origen) the text current at Caesarea. Granted that 'Levi' is right and 'James' is wrong, the problem that demands a solution is how 'Levi' managed to survive into the 4th century.

F. C. BURKITT.

### MARK VIII 12 AND $\epsilon\iota$ IN HELLENISTIC GREEK.

MR COLEMAN'S interesting and suggestive article in the last number of the JOURNAL seems to me to call for a reply by some one who like me feels that it is unsound, or at least contains some leading ideas which are unsound. And to begin at the end, I cannot think that his explanation of Mark viii 12 is convincing. It is true that the First and Third Gospels both report our Lord as saying that no sign would be given to that generation but the sign of Jonah. Granted: but the insertion of the sign of Jonah in Matt. xvi 4<sup>1</sup> is surely due to the Evangelist. At another time and place our Lord doubtless 'reserved to Himself the sign of the true prophet', to use Mr Coleman's excellent phrase, but at 'Dalmanutha' (i. e. Tiberias) in the presence of carping adversaries the blunt refusal of Mark viii 12 seems to me alone appropriate, much more appropriate than the vague announcement

<sup>1</sup> On p. 166, l. 20, Matt. xvi 16 is a slip for xvi 4.